



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

will continue it to her in all the like events and accidents of this world. So that a Pope was not necessary to the existence of the Church, even though there should NEVER MORE HAVE BEEN A POPE.*

These are the words of a Roman Catholic who had deeply studied the history of his own Church. No true Protestant will object to his confidence in the promises of God to his Church. If Roman Catholics would study the history of their Church with the same accuracy, and think of it with the same candour, the whole Church of Christ might even now be reunited again.

The moral of the whole history is this—the promises of God to his Church are the same in all ages; whatever promises the Popes have now, the same promises belonged to the Popes of the tenth century. If the performance of God's promises to the Church in the tenth century was not through the Popes, neither is it through the Popes now. The Popes of the nineteenth century may be better in some things, and may be worse in others, than the Popes of the tenth century; but if there are no more promises to the Popes in one age than to the Popes in another, then we must try the Popes in each age by their conformity to "the faith once delivered to the saints." We must try to do it while we live ourselves, and not leave it to be found out by others, some centuries hence, whether the Popes, whom all the world acknowledged while they were living, were false Popes or not. It will not do to discover the validity of their claims, or the truth of their teaching, in purgatory or in hell.

If we close our history with the century we undertook, it is not for want of materials to proceed with. Benedict VIII., who died in 1024, is said, by Labbe and Cossart,† to have appeared to his successor to beg to be got out of Purgatory. But, for our parts, we think, if there be such a place, a Pope of that age who got admission there might be thought a lucky fellow.

Benedict IX. was appointed in the year 1033, being then eleven years of age! and although, even at that age, an example of unelasticity, "the universal Catholic world, which is wonderful, worshipped him as the successor of Peter, and recognised him as the Pope of Rome!"‡ This Pope devoted his whole life to his lusts, and at last resigned the Papacy, that he might have nothing but his lusts to think of! But he held it for eleven years, and during that time there were at one period three Popes together—Benedict IX., Sylvester III., and John the Dean of Rome. On which the Jesuits say—"Thus a three-headed beast, rising from the gates of hell, most miserably infested the most holy chair of Peter!"§

It is with disgust and shame that we have soiled our pages with such histories as these; but while Roman Catholics make the claims they do for the Papacy—while they affirm, that except through the Papacy, the promises of God cannot be fulfilled to his Church—we must point to the HISTORY OF THE PAPACY, and ask "IS THAT THE FULFILMENT?" And as often henceforth as the claims of the Papacy are discussed in our pages, that history will be pointed to, and that question asked.

PIOUS FRAUDS—NO. III.

RELICS—NO. II.

IN our last December number we gave our readers an account of some of the spurious relics which the cupidity of the ecclesiastics of the middle ages palmed upon the superstition and ignorance of those who were credulous enough to abandon the use of their reason and the evidence of their senses out of deference to authority, and many of which, though long since exposed, continue to deceive multitudes of people throughout every Roman Catholic country in Christendom.

The last article we mentioned was the miraculously multiplied towel with which our blessed Lord wiped the feet of the apostles, one of which is shown at the Lateran, in Rome; a second, at Aix-la-Chapelle, in Prussia; and a third, at St. Cornille de Compiègne, in France.

This brings us naturally to treat of the linen cloths (called in Latin by Roman Catholic writers, *sudaria*, which we may, perhaps, with Webster and others, translate "sudaries") in which we read in the Gospel narratives that our Lord's dead body was wrapped when laid in the tomb by Joseph of Arimathea.

It may be proper here to recal to the memory of our readers what the Holy Scriptures have recorded about them. The Gospel narrative is simply as follows:—

St. Matt. xxvii. 57—"And when it was evening there came a certain rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was a disciple of Jesus. He went to Pilate and asked the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded that the body should be delivered. And Joseph taking the body wrapt it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new monument, which he had hewed out in a rock. And he rolled in a great stone to the door of the monument, and went his way."

St. Luke xxiii. 50 gives a similar account of the transaction.

St. John xix. 40 says—"They (Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus) took therefore the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now, there was in the place where he was crucified a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, where no man yet had been laid. There, therefore, because of the paraceve ("preparation day"—*Authorized Version*) of the Jews, they laid Jesus, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand. And on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene cometh early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre; and she saw the stone taken away from the sepulchre. She ran, therefore, and cometh to Simon Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith to them, they have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter, therefore, went out and that other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre. And they ran both together, and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And when he had stooped down, he saw the linen clothes lying; but yet he went not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, wrapt up into one place. Then that other disciple also went in, who came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. The disciples, therefore, departed again to their home."

We read nothing here of the likeness of our Lord's body being miraculously impressed on its wrapping sheet—though, if it was true, it would have been a most remarkable and marvellous event, worthy of being recorded; and, indeed, much more important to mention than the mere fact that certain women followed Jesus to the place of crucifixion without meeting with any miracle, or that when the disciples visited his tomb they found the linen clothes lying, and the napkin which wrapped his head lying in a place by itself—matters one would conceive of very trivial importance to be recorded, if anything connected with such a solemn event were not interesting to his believing followers. Can any one doubt, too, if they who went to seek the Lord's body had really found such a full length likeness of it as is now exhibited in the places we shall presently mention, that either the disciples or the faithful women would have at once removed them, and proclaimed and showed to their companions and friends so remarkable a corroboration of their story? and if they did not remove them at once, is it probable that they would afterwards have returned to the sepulchre, where they knew he was not, when they had positive proof that he was actually risen from the dead, and had no longer any object in going there? Be this, however, as it may, it is the boast of a number of modern towns—for instance, Turin, Caracassone, Nice, Aix-la-Chapelle, Treves, Besançon, and six or seven other places—that each of them possesses the whole original linen cloth or sheet mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, to say nothing of a variety of fragments of it to be seen elsewhere; and thousands of persons, for centuries, have undertaken, and possibly still undertake, long pilgrimages, at much expense and fatigue, in order to see these sheets or *sudaries*, of which, if we were to grant that any one of them was the *real* sheet in which Christ's body was wrapped 1800 years ago, it is manifest that *all the rest* must be wicked impostures to deceive the public for the sake of gain. That none of them, however, is really what is pretended is plain from the following considerations, if, indeed, any negative proof were required, where no affirmative proof exists to counterbalance the antecedent improbability of the whole story. Whenever the "holy sudary" is exhibited they show a large sheet with the full-length likeness of a human body on it. The most celebrated of them—the *holy sudarium* of Turin—is a long linen sheet, upon which is painted, in a reddish colour, a double likeness of a human body—i.e., as seen from before and behind, quite naked, with the exception of a broad scarf encircling the loins. Now, we have seen that St. John's Gospel says that Christ's body was "bound in linen clothes, as the manner of the Jews is to bury"—and what was that custom? This may be known by their present custom, and their books which describe the ancient ceremony of interment among them, which was to wrap the body in a sheet to the shoulders, and to cover the head with a separate cloth. This is precisely as the evangelist, St. John, described it, saying "then cometh Simon Peter, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, wrapt up into one place." Can any proof be more convincing that these "*holy sudaries*" are not the genuine linen clothes which wrapped the Saviour's body, or the *napkin* which was about his head, but a clumsy fabrication by men who were, perhaps, as ignorant of Jewish customs and of the Scripture narrative, as they were of the rival relics of the same kind in other places.

The history of the sudary of Turin is curious, as it shows that the efforts of enlightened and pious prelates, even in the Church of Rome, to prevent idolatrous practices invading their churches, proved unavailing against that general tendency to worship visible objects, so strongly

implanted in corrupt human nature, that, even in this enlightened age, we are continually witnessing such manifestations of its revival as may be compared only to that of the dark period of the middle ages.* It is pretended that this relic was saved by a Christian at the taking of Jerusalem by Titus; that it was brought back to Palestine in 640, from whence it was transferred to Europe by the Crusaders. It was taken by a French knight, named Geoffroi de Charny, who presented it to the collegiate church of a place called Liré, situate about three leagues from Troyes, in Champagne; the donor declaring that this holy sheet was taken by him from the infidels (why the infidels should have thought it worth preserving does not appear), and that it had delivered him in a miraculous manner from a prison dungeon into which he had been cast by the English. The canons of the church at Liré (which place, by the way, belonged to the knightly narrator of the miracle, and who, consequently, had a personal interest in drawing pilgrims thereto) seeing at once the great profits to be derived from such a relic, lost no time in exhibiting it, and the church forthwith was crowded with devotees. The Bishop of Troyes, Henri de Poitiers, however (not being, we suppose, personally interested, and finding no proofs of the authenticity of the pretended relic), prohibited it to be shown as an object of worship, and it remained unheeded for twenty-four years. After the death, however, of Bishop Henri, the sons of Geoffroi de Charny, about the year 1388, obtained permission from the papal legate to restore this relic of their father's to the Church of Liré, and the canons exposed it in front of the pulpit, surrounding it with lighted tapers. The Bishop of Troyes (Peter D'Arcy), however, was as incredulous as his predecessor, Henri de Poitiers, and, in spite of the legate, he prohibited the exhibition under pain of excommunication. Geoffroi's sons afterwards obtained from the king, Charles VI., an authorization to worship the *holy sudarium* in the said Church of Liré. The bishop was, however, as persevering as they were, and himself repaired to court, and represented to the king that the worship of the pretended sheet of Jesus Christ was nothing less than downright idolatry, and argued so effectually, that Charles revoked the permission by an edict, dated August 21, 1389. Geoffroi de Charny's sons had, however, too deep an interest in the matter even to let it drop there, and they appealed to Pope Clement VII., who was residing at Avignon; and he granted permission for the *holy sudarium* to be exhibited. The Bishop of Troyes then sent a memorial to the Pope, explaining the importance attached to this so-called holy relic, and so far prevailed, that though Clement did not prohibit the sudarium from being shown, he forbade it to be exhibited as the *real* sudary of Jesus Christ. The canons of Liré, being thus checkmated, put aside their sudary, which they were only permitted to show on the terms of not asserting it to be genuine; but it, not long after, re-appeared in other places, and, after being shown about in various churches and convents, it seems to have remained in Chambery, about 1482, where nobody dared to impugn its reality. From that time its fame increased, and Francis I., King of France, went a pilgrimage, on foot, the whole way from Lyons to Chambery, in order to worship this linen cloth. In 1578, St. Carlo Borromeo, having announced his intention of going from Milan, on foot, to Chambery, to adore the holy sudary, the Duke of Savoy, wishing to spare this high-born saint the trouble of so long a pilgrimage, had the relic brought to Turin, where it has since remained, and where the alleged miracles performed by it, and the solemn worship paid to it, may be considered as a proof that its authenticity is no longer doubted.

We should be glad to know whether Pope Clement was right when he prohibited its being worshipped as the *real* sudary, or whether St. Carlo Borromeo was an idolator when he worshipped it as genuine?

Akin to these holy sudaries, is the smaller sudary, or handkerchief of Veronica, which is shown in the Church of St. Peter at Rome, with the face of Jesus Christ miraculously imprinted on it. It is recorded that a kerchief with the likeness of our Lord's face upon it, and covered with blood and sweat, was kept in a church at Rome in the 11th century. It is noted in a brief of Pope Sergius IV., dated 1011. We do not know what tales respecting this relic were related at that time; but it appears that copies of it, called *Veronics* (a corruption of "vera icon," "the true image") were sold; and, no doubt, this appellation gave rise to the *legend of Sancta Veronica*, who wiped the face of our Lord with her kerchief as he was going to Calvary. The evangelists, we need scarcely remark, when naming the women who followed our Lord to the place of crucifixion, make not the least mention of this Veronica being among them—though, if true, it was so marvellous and remarkable an event, that the face of Jesus Christ should have been miraculously imprinted on a handkerchief with which a woman named Veronica wiped away the blood and sweat from it, that it was much more worthy of being recorded by the evangelists than many other things which they have minutely recorded connected with the occasion.

There are many versions of this legend (with other

* Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 10. Jenkins, fourth edition. Dublin, 1737.

† Vol. ix., 810.

‡ Tamen universus orbis Catholicus, quod mirandum est, eundem successorem Petri coluit, et pro Romano pontifice agnovit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 936.

§ Atque ita triiceps bestia ab inferorum portis emergens sanctissimam Petri Cathedralam miserrime infestavit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 937.

* St. John xx. 6, 7.

* Let those who think this an exaggeration remember the pilgrimage to the Holy Coat of Treves, and the recent translation of the bones of St. Theodosia at Amiens, described in our last August number—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 92; or the life of St. Philomena, same volume, p. 56.

legends of the same date), some stating that it was this woman whom Jesus cured of the bloody issue; whilst others maintain that she was no less a woman than Berenice, niece to King Herod. It is also said that after the dispersion of the Apostles, St. Veronica went in company with Mary Magdalene, Martha, and Lazarus, to Marseilles, where she wrought many miracles with her kerchief. The Emperor Tiberius (the legend proceeds) heard of these miracles, and, having fallen ill, summoned Veronica to Rome, where she cured him in an instant, and was rewarded with great honours and rich presents, though, ungratefully enough, he lived and died a pagan. The remainder of her life is said to have been spent at Rome, in company with St. Peter and St. Paul, and she bequeathed the miraculous handkerchief to Pope St. Clement. Notwithstanding all this, and though she is said to have suffered martyrdom in France, and, we believe, is acknowledged as a saint and allotted a place in the calendar, this legend has never yet, we believe, received the official approbation of the Roman Catholic Church, and may, therefore, we presume, be disbelieved without pain of mortal sin. Perhaps, however, as Pope Pius IX. has lately flattered, for the first time, another miracle, as old as Christianity itself, in his recent Bull, he may also, ere long, put the seal of his approbation on the legend of St. Veronica's handkerchief also.

We have not yet done with this instructive subject, and shall probably give our readers a few additional specimens of spurious relics in an early number.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 7.)

In the prosecution of any favourite object, what persevering industry is employed by man in the examination of all its bearings upon the destiny of his future life; and what energy he exercises, in examining all its collateral consequences? But, alas, what little exertion is employed in examining the doctrine of man's salvation, the most important subject that could engage the mind of man. The salvation of our souls is their deliverance from the guilt of sin, and the verdict of God is, that all have sinned—"There is none righteous, no, not one." But is there no hope for the guilty, no pardon for the condemned? Yes, there is: To the Lord our God, belong mercies and forgiveness, though we have rebelled against him.—Dan. ix. 9. When the guilty repent sincerely, a full and free pardon of their sins is imparted to them. God says, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."—Heb. viii. 12. The moment the sinner repents, he is free from the condemnation of punishment. David says (Psalms xxxiii. 1, 2), "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no sin. And, again, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." A full and entire remission of all their sins is granted them, through the all-sufficient merits of Christ's atonement, and the black catalogue of their crimes, which have been written down in the book of God's remembrance, by the recording angel, shall, by one penitential tear, be blotted out for ever.

A great portion of my time and attention has been hitherto devoted to the examination of the doctrine of salvation, as it is taught in the catechisms and in the Maynooth Class-book; and I found, in those books, no proofs taken from the Scripture, from the Fathers, or from the records of the early Churches, in support of the doctrine of salvation, as it is inculcated in the Church of Rome. But I found salvation more difficult to be attained in that Church than in the reformed Catholic Church, for the following reasons:—There were twelve new articles added to the original belief by Pius IV., six commandments, and five sacraments, by the Council of Trent—making altogether 23 new articles to be believed, more than are to be found in the belief of the early Churches, and not found at present in the Church of England; and to increase the difficulty, the members of the Church of Rome must believe them to be of divine institution, without proof and contrary to evidence, or an anathema will be hurled against them from the castle of St. Angelo: and it is thus the Church of Rome puts an extinguisher upon free inquiry, contrary to the doctrine of St. Paul, "prove all things."

As indulgences are hinged upon confession, I shall take them in order, and examine upon what authority they are founded. Pius IV. says—"I, also, affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people." The Council of Trent says (Sess. 25)—"Since the power of granting indulgences has been bestowed by Christ to his Church, and she has exercised this power from the earliest antiquity, the holy Council teaches and enjoins, that the use of indulgences is, in the highest degree, salutary to Christian people; and it condemns with anathema those who assert, that they are useless, or deny that the power of granting them is in the Church." Here are the "ipsissima verba" of the Pope, and the decree of the Fathers of Trent, without any Scriptural authority, or definition of indulgences. But the catechism says, "that an indulgence is a release from the temporal punishment due to those sins that have been forgiven us by penance and confession, by means of the superabundant merits of Christ and his saints, which are applied to our souls, by the special favour of the Church." From this

doctrine I can conclude, that the merits of Christ alone are not sufficient without the addition of the merits of the saints; which must be considered as nothing less than awful impiety; and that our Blessed Lord did not speak the truth, when he said to his disciples, that they could have no merit of themselves—"When ye have done all things commanded, say, we are unprofitable servants" (Luke xvii. 10); which borders very closely on blasphemy. The Church of Rome holds, that the punishment incurred by sin is both temporal and eternal. That the eternal punishment is removed by the absolution of the priest, but that the temporal punishment must be paid in this life by penance, or in the next by the flames of Purgatory.

There is a well-known axiom in all schools, "qui potest majus, potest et minus eodem sub respectu." According to this principle, the priest who can absolve from the eternal guilt, can a fortiori absolve from the temporal punishment. The difference between the Church of Rome and Scripture doctrine is very perceptible in this instance. An Apostle tells you that if you confess your sins to God, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from ALL unrighteousness.—John i. 1, 9.

When God pardons a sinner, it is not by half measures, but he pardons him fully as well as freely, and eternally, by his own gracious agency, without money and without price; without sacerdotal interference, or Papal indulgences. Of this you have a striking instance in the case of the man who was sick of the palsy; and also in the instance of the weeping penitent of Bethany. My reading does not enable me to go, nor do I believe can any one, farther back than the first crusade, to establish the origin of indulgences. At that time of fanatical enthusiasm, the prison-doors of all Europe were thrown open to all prisoners, however enormous their crimes, and an indulgence was granted to all those who would join the standard of the cross, and a plenary indulgence was to be applied to the souls of all those who fell by the hand of the Saracen, or who plunged their consecrated swords into the heart of an infidel. The next place I find indulgences issued from the treasury of the Vatican, was at the commencement of the pontificate of Leo X., to finish the magnificent Church of St. Peter in Rome. For this ostensible purpose, indulgences were sold, and the traffic was carried to a shameful excess in the beginning of the sixteenth century, till this coin became so base by its too frequent currency, that it led to the Reformation, the happiest event that could happen to promote the civil, political, and religious liberty of Europe. The jubilee or plenary indulgence is of pagan origin, and was introduced into the Church of Rome by Martin V., in order to fill his exhausted treasury, and to facilitate his entry into Rome, after the great schism of the west. The word jubilee signifies a time of rejoicing. In the Old Testament it occurred every fiftieth year after the completion of the seven Sabbatical years, during each of which all labour ceased for man and beast; and even the land itself was allowed a seasonable repose. But we do not find the word jubilee in the New Scripture. It is a well-authenticated historical fact, that the Popes, after being forced to leave the Eternal City in consequence of their tyranny and political oppressions, resided at Avignon in France, during the period of 75 years; and that Otho Colonna was the first Pope who was induced to return to the City of the Hills, by Petrarch, to dry up the tears of the disconsolate widow who was mourning, in sackcloth and ashes, the absence of the spiritual father of the people. The deserted city, during her melancholy widowhood, has been pathetically, yet beautifully described by the elegant muse of Petrarch, at the revival of literature, in the commencement of the 15th century. Otho Colonna was the son of a Roman citizen of great ancestral claims upon the gratitude of the Roman people; when a period of great scarcity occurred, and the people were dying by hundreds of hunger, this benevolent Roman threw open his purse and his granaries, and saved the remnant of an expiring people. In gratitude, the people raised a column to his memory; and, in subsequent times, the family name was changed to Colonna. After the deposition of the Popes of Avignon, Martin V. was elected, and took every precaution to insure himself a favourable reception in his native city. Amongst the ancient customs of the Romans was, that of celebrating secular games on the first day of January of every century, in honour of the age of the Eternal City. The new Pope was well acquainted with the Carmen Seculare, which he read in his more youthful days, in the Odes of Horace, and was sung by a choir of youths dressed in the most gorgeous attire, amidst the shouts of an admiring people, who rolled along in one unbroken wave, from the steps of the Pantheon to the majestic dome of the Capitol. After which a donative was given to the people. Pope Martin deferred his entry into the city of Rome, until the first day of January, after his elevation to that See, and had, in the meantime, hymns of jubilee composed, to be sung on the occasion, by youths beautifully dressed, in imitation of the custom of heathen Rome. On the first of January he made his public entry into the city of the Cæsars, surrounded with all that was not only respectable, but magnificent, and preceded by a multitude of people who joined the youths in singing jubilate to Martin V., the representative of Colonna, the saviour of the Roman people. After the procession—a civic ovation—the Roman people were ordered to make an offering at the shrine of the

apostles, and a plenary indulgence was pronounced by Martin V. from the balcony of the Vatican. By means of this happy device, the Papal treasury was once more filled to overflowing, and the Pope was in a position to give a donation to the inhabitants of the city in imitation of the Roman emperors. Thus, the citizens of Rome, and all those who thronged into the city, were enabled to return to their respective homes, with erect heads and light hearts, after being relieved from an oppressive weight of sin by this timely yet imaginary indulgence.

The sale of indulgences, under the pontificate of Leo X., by Tetzel, a low, unprincipled man, who was selected by the Archbishop of Magdeburg, together with the great immorality of the clergy of the 16th century, were the proximate causes that led to the Reformation. From that period the human mind was emancipated from all the superstitious ignorance of the barbarous ages, and recovered its natural elasticity, while it shook off that oppressive weight which debased its powers and cramped its energies.

As it is with the doctrine of the Church of Rome I have to do, the immorality of the clergy before and at the time of the Reformation is foreign to my purpose, and I shall abstain from any inquiry into that disagreeable subject, and leave that task to others who may feel it their duty to expose it.

In proportion as we ascend to the days of the apostles the nearer we approach the noble simplicity of the Christian religion, like the radii of a circle that converge to its centre. The great advantage to be derived from falling back upon primary principles, is to be learned from Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws, in which he says, that as soon as he found out first principles, the laws by which nations are governed became very easy to him. Let us go back in imitation of that great man to the primary principles that are to be found in the Holy Scriptures, and we cannot fail in detecting the errors that have by degrees crept into the Church since the period of the apostolic age.

The next question I had to examine in the category was, "Is the Latin language which is used in the Roman Liturgy in accordance with Gospel principles?" I answer, certainly not; as we read in the Acts ii. 4, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance. And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to another, 'Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans. And how hear we, every man in his own tongue, wherein we were born, the wonderful works of God?'" The apostles received on this occasion from the Holy Spirit the power of speaking different languages, in order that their preaching might be understood in every part of the world.—In Mesopotamia and Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia. Yet the Church of Rome continues to have her prayers read in a dead language, which is not understood by the people. St. Paul devotes an entire chapter—the fourteenth of the first Corinthians—to this subject, to show the necessity of speaking in a language which the people can understand—"If I pray in an unknown tongue my understanding is unfruitful." The clergymen of the reformed Churches pray with their faces to their respective flocks, and, at the same time, in their vernacular language; whereas the priests pray with their backs to the people, and in a language which they do not understand—no, not even the clerk who makes the responses. In this instance the Church of Rome acts in direct opposition to her own decree, as the fourth Council of Lateran established it as a rule that the service should be in the vulgar tongue of every nation; and we find it so in every nation independent of Rome.

(To be continued.)

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVII.

PAT and Jem did not get together for a good while to have a talk; but at last they fell in on the road, and were walking together; but Pat did little at the talking, but kept looking mighty hard at his old coat, first at one sleeve and then at the other, and then on the big patches on the breast of it.

And, indeed, poor Pat's coat was very bad. It was once made all of blue frieze, and then it must have looked very smart; but, when times got hard, Pat had to get a piece on the coat betimes, because he never had the price of a new one; so there were black patches, and gray patches, and patches the colour of mud; and there were the legs of two old stockings, sewed over the arms, from the wrists to the elbows, to keep the patches together; and all the patches looked as if the best wife in the country could not keep them together much longer.

So Pat kept looking mighty hard at his coat, and talking little.

"What's the matter with the coat at all?" said Jem.

"Well, I'm studying the old coat," said Pat.

"Is it how to get a new one, you mean?" said Jem.

"Time enough to study that when the meal gets cheaper," said Pat; "it's this old coat I'm studying."

"Well, and what do you make out of the old one?" said Jem.

"Well, I had a discussion on it last night," said Pat, "and I didn't think there was as much to be got out of an old coat."

"And what's to be got out of it?" said Jem; "tell us that, Pat."